NIIG-DP-00-5
January, 2001
hep-th/??????

BRS Symmetry, the Quantum Master Equation, and the Wilsonian Renormalization Group

Yuji Igarashi, Katsumi Itoh and Hiroto So[a]

Faculty of Education, Niigata University, Niigata 950-2181, Japan
[a] *Department of Physics, Niigata University, Niigata 950-2181, Japan*

Abstract

Recently we made a proposal for realization of an effective BRS symmetry along the Wilsonian renormalization group flow. In this paper we show that the idea can be naturally extended for the most general gauge theories. Extensive use of the antifield formalism is made to reveal some remarkable structure of the effective BRS symmetry. The average action defined with a continuum analog of the block spin transformation obeys the quantum master equation (QME), provided that an UV action does so. We show that the RG flow described by the exact flow equations is generated by canonical transformations in the field-antifield space. Using the relation between the average action and the Legendre effective action, we establish the equivalence between the QME for the average action and the modified Ward-Takahashi identity for the Legendre action. The QME remains intact when the regularization is removed.

PACS: 11.10Hi; 11.15.Tk; 11.30.-j
Keywords: renormalization group; quantum master equation; Becchi-Rouet-Stora transformation; Ward-Takahashi identity; effective action

1 Introduction

The Wilsonian Renormalization Group (RG)[1] is formulated in such a way that modes with frequencies higher than a reference scale k are integrated out to yield an effective action for lower momentum modes. The resulting action is shown to obey the exact RG flow equations[2-5], an invaluable tool in studies of field theories. In realizing gauge symmetries, however, one needs to deal with all the momentum scales on an equal footing, and it conflicts with the introduction of such a cutoff. Thus, the reconciliation between regularizations and gauge symmetries is a long-standing problem in the RG approach.

In recent years, there have been considerable efforts to investigate the problem[6-17]: Becchi showed in his seminal paper[7] that symmetry breaking due to regularization can be compensated by gauge non-invariant counter terms. The compensation called "fine-tuning condition" was analyzed in detail within a perturbative framework[9]. Further, Ellwanger made an important observation[11]. He showed that once the "modified Ward-Takahashi (WT) or Slavnov-Taylor (ST) identity" is satisfied at a fixed IR cutoff k, it holds along the RG flow. A perturbative formulation to solve the identities was given in ref.[12].

The attempts in the last decade suggest the possibility that there exists a cutoff-dependent effective gauge symmetry despite suffering from a deformation due to a regularization. This expectation has been enhanced by the recent breakthrough for the realization of a chiral symmetry on the lattice: Lüscher constructed an exact chiral symmetry transformation for lattice fermions[18], relying on the Ginsparg-Wilson relation[19]. The transformation depends on the Dirac operator as well as a lattice spacing.

In our previous publications[20][21], we took a step further for the realization of effective symmetries. We showed that the WT identities for a Wilsonian effective action take the form of the quantum master equation (QME) in the Batalin-Vilkovisky (BV) antifield formalism[22], thereby formulating *renormalized symmetries* realized along the RG flow. The formalism is quite general and it applies to BRS as well as other global symmetries. The basic notions of the formalism are those introduced by Wetterich in a continuum analog of the block spin transformation[5]: the average action of the macroscopic or IR fields, which are obtained by the coarse graining of microscopic or UV fields.[1] It should be noticed in this connection that Ginsparg and Wilson used also the block spin transformation for lattice fermions in their pioneering work[19]. Therefore, one might ask if the QME and the renormalized transformation formulated for the chiral symmetry actually produce the continuum counterparts of the Ginsparg-Wilson relation and the Lüscher's chiral transformation. We showed in [20] that this is indeed the case. This result is certainly encouraging and considered as a nontrivial check on our formalism.

In the specific examples discussed in [20], the average actions have exact renormalized symmetries. It is however not the case for more general interacting theories. There, non-vanishing variation of the average action should be canceled by some other contributions, which have been recognized as "symmetry breaking terms" in the literature. However, it

[1] A similar attempt which introduces two kinds of the fields was given in [10].

does not necessarily mean breakdown of the symmetry: one should take account not only of the transformation of the action but also of the jacobian factor associated with a change of the functional measure. Cancellation between these two effects makes it possible to define an exact symmetry for the quantum system under consideration. This is what the QME tells us.

Although the above results may be considered as desired conceptual progress, there remain the following questions to be clarified: (1) How can we specify the symmetry of the UV action in the presence of a BRS non-invariant UV regularization? (2) Can the antifield formalism give new insights into the RG approach? (3) Does the QME reduce to the standard WT identity when the regularization is removed? (4) How is the QME related to other WT identities given so far for the Wilsonian or the Legendre effective actions?

In this paper, we develop our formalism further to discuss these problems. To address the question (1), we arrange a regularization in such a way that the integration of the UV fields is performed for those modes with momenta between k and an UV cutoff Λ. Our basic assumption on the UV action is that it is a solution of the QME. Its justification will be reported in the forthcoming paper [23]. With the assumption, we show that the resulting average action obeys the QME expressed with the IR fields. It demonstrates the presence of an exact BRS symmetry along the RG flow. This generalizes our previous discussion where the UV action was assumed to satisfy the classical master equation.

Concerning the question (2), we will discuss the following two points in this paper. First we can deal with the most general gauge theories with open and/or reducible gauge algebra. It is straightforward to make this extension, once a local UV action for such a theory is given in the antifield formalism. Second we shall show that a change of the average action along the RG flow can be described by a canonical transformation in the space of the IR fields and their antifields. It has been known that a change in the Wilsonian effective action along the RG flow can be interpreted as a reparametrization of the fields[13]. The antifield formalism provides its natural extension. We note that the jacobian factor of the canonical transformation should be added to the action. The action with the correction then satisfies the QME again.

In order to discuss the questions (3) and (4), we define a subtracted average action, which is the generating functional of the connected cutoff Green functions for the UV fields. The subtracted average action is well-defined in the IR limit, while the average action has a regulator which diverges in the limit $k \to 0$. The Legendre effective action obtained from the subtracted action is also well-defined in the IR limit. There is a simple relation[24] between the average action for the IR fields and the Legendre effective action for the UV fields. Using this, we shall show that the QME for the average action is equivalent to the "modified WT identity" for the Legendre effective action. For a specific case of pure Yang-Mills theory, it reduces to the "modified ST identity" given by Ellwanger[11]. The "symmetry breaking terms" in the "modified WT identity"are thus identified with those coming from the jacobian factor in the path integral of the IR fields [21]. The boundary conditions on the cutoff functions imply the validity of the "modified WT identity" in the IR limit. As for the UV cutoff, one can take the UV limit $\Lambda \to \infty$

in renormalizable theories. We conclude therefore that the QME for the average action remains intact, and becomes equivalent to the Zinn-Justin equation for the Legendre effective action in the limit where the regulator is removed by taking $k \to 0,\ \Lambda \to \infty$.

This paper is organized as follows: the next section describes a brief summary of the antifield formalism and the construction of the average action. We show that the QME for the IR fields is obtained from the functional average of the QME for the UV fields. In section 3, the exact RG flow equation is given for the average action. The evolution equation of the WT functional is obtained as well. We also construct the canonical transformation which generates the RG flow. The section 4 discusses the relation between the average action and the Legendre effective action. The equivalence between the QME and the "modified WT identity" is shown. The final section contains our conclusions and a short outlook. Our notation and some notes on our computations are summarized in appendices.

2 The average action in the antifield formalism

2.1 The antifield formalism

To be self-contained, let us first summarize briefly the Batalin-Vilkovisky (BV) antifield formalism,[2] and then use it to construct the average action. Our formulation applies to the most general gauge theories. Their gauge algebra can be open and/or reducible.

Let us consider a gauge theory in the d-dimensional Euclidean space. It consists of gauge and matter fields denoted collectively by ϕ_0^i, as well as ghosts, antighosts and B-fields. If the gauge algebra is reducible, we should further add ghosts for ghosts, their antighosts and B-fields. Let $\phi^A = \{\phi_0^i, ...\}$ be all the fields introduced above and ϕ^*_A be their antifields. The index A labels Lorentz indices of tensor fields, the spinor indices of the fermions, and/or indices distinguishing different types of generic fields. The Grassmann parities for ϕ^A and ϕ^*_A are expressed as $\epsilon(\phi^A) = \epsilon_A$ and $\epsilon(\phi^*_A) = \epsilon_A + 1$. The antibracket in the space of $\{\phi,\ \phi^*\}$ is then defined as

$$\begin{aligned}(F,\ G)_\phi &\equiv \frac{\partial^r F}{\partial \phi^A}\frac{\partial^l G}{\partial \phi^*_A} - \frac{\partial^r F}{\partial \phi^*_A}\frac{\partial^l G}{\partial \phi^A} \\ &= \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d}\left[\frac{\partial^r F}{\partial \phi^A(-p)}\frac{\partial^l G}{\partial \phi^*_A(p)} - \frac{\partial^r F}{\partial \phi^*_A(-p)}\frac{\partial^l G}{\partial \phi^A(p)}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

To make our equations simple, we use a matrix notation in the momentum space as given in appendix A.

We begin with a gauge invariant action $S_0[\phi_0]$. The first step in the antifield formalism is to construct a classical extended action $\tilde{S}_{cl}[\phi,\ \phi^*]$ as a power series expansion of the antifields:

$$\tilde{S}_{cl}[\phi,\ \phi^*] = S_0[\phi_0] + \phi^*_A P^A[\phi] + \phi^*_A \phi^*_B Q^{AB}[\phi] + \cdots. \tag{2.2}$$

[2]See [25] for reviews on this subject.

The coefficient functions such as P^A and Q^{AB} should be fixed by the requirement that the $\tilde{S}_{cl}$ satisfy the (classical) master equation[22],

$$\left(\tilde{S}_{cl},\ \tilde{S}_{cl}\right)_\phi = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

It incorporates all the information of the underlying gauge algebra.

The next step is the gauge fixing. To this aim, one introduces the gauge fixing fermion $\Psi(\phi^A)$, a function which does not depend on the antifields. A possible way of gauge fixing is to eliminate the antifields by imposing the conditions $\phi^*_A = \partial\Psi/\partial\phi^A$. Alternatively, one may perform the canonical transformation in the space of fields and antifields: $\phi^A \to \phi^A,\ \phi^*_A \to \phi^*_A + \partial\Psi/\partial\phi^A$, where the Ψ acts as the generator of the canonical transformation. This choice of coordinates, called the gauge-fixed basis, allows us to retain antifields until the end of calculations. In the following, we take this basis and use the notation $S_{cl}[\phi,\ \phi^*] \equiv \tilde{S}_{cl}[\phi,\ \phi^* + \partial\Psi/\partial\phi]$. In the new basis, the classical master equation still holds, because an antibracket is invariant under a canonical transformation.

In the BV quantization, the classical action $S_{cl}[\phi,\ \phi^*]$ should be replaced by a quantum action $S[\phi,\ \phi^*]$, on which one imposes the quantum master equation (QME)[22] in place of (2.3):

$$\Sigma[\phi,\ \phi^*] \equiv \hbar^2 \exp(S/\hbar)\Delta_\phi \exp(-S/\hbar) = \frac{1}{2}\left(S,\ S\right)_\phi - \hbar\Delta_\phi S = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

The functional Σ will be called as the WT functional in the rest of the paper. The Δ_ϕ derivative reads

$$\Delta_\phi \ \equiv\ (-)^{\epsilon_A+1}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\phi^A}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\phi^*_A} = (-)^{\epsilon_A+1}\int\frac{d^dp}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\phi^A(-p)}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\phi^*_A(p)}. \tag{2.5}$$

It is a nilpotent operator,

$$\left(\Delta_\phi\right)^2 = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

The QME ensures the BRS invariance of the quantum system.

2.2 The IR fields and the average action

In this subsection, we construct a Wilsonian effective action, the average action. Let us begin with the path integral representation of the generating functional for a local quantum action S in the presence of sources J_A:

$$\begin{aligned} Z[J] &= \int\mathcal{D}\phi^*\prod_A\delta(\phi^*_A)Z[J,\ \phi^*], \\ Z[J,\ \phi^*] &= \int\mathcal{D}\phi\exp\frac{1}{\hbar}\left(-S[\phi,\ \phi^*] + J_A\phi^A\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

In this path integral (2.7), the antifields ϕ^*_A are integrated out for the gauge fixing. As is seen below, this is important also for the discussion on the canonical structure in

the space of fields and antifields. For the fields ϕ^A, the quantum modes with arbitrary momenta are to be integrated at the same time. The main idea of the Wilsonian RG is to perform the integration successively: one integrates the high frequency modes of the fields ϕ^A to obtain an effective theory for the low frequency modes. For the division of momenta, one introduces an IR cutoff k. Furthermore, in order for the integration of the higher frequencies to be well-defined, the presence of an UV regulator is assumed. We consider here a regularization in which an UV cutoff Λ is introduced together with the IR cutoff k in a same regulator, regarding the frequencies between k and Λ as generating the "block spin action" for the frequencies lower than k. We shall construct this effective action called the average action, slightly modifying Wetterich's method[5]. This formalism uses two kinds of fields: the microscopic or UV fields ϕ^A in (2.7), and the macroscopic or IR fields Φ^A identified roughly with the average fields obtained by the coarse graining of the UV fields. In order to realize this idea, we take the following steps. Consider a gaussian integral

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= N_{k\Lambda} \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \mathcal{D}\Phi^* \prod_A \delta\left(\Phi^*_A - f^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\phi^*_A\right) \ \exp -\frac{1}{\hbar}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi^A - f_{k\Lambda}\phi^A - f^{-1}_{k\Lambda} J_C (R^{-1}_{k\Lambda})^{CA}\right)\right. \\ &\qquad \left. \times R^{k\Lambda}_{AB}\left(\Phi^B - f_{k\Lambda}\phi^B - (R^{-1}_{k\Lambda})^{BD} f^{-1}_{k\Lambda} J_D\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where we have used the matrix notation and $N_{k\Lambda}$ is the normalization function. Shortly we describe properties of the invertible matrix $(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}$ and the function $f_{k\Lambda}$. Let us insert (2.8) into (2.7) and rewrite it as

$$Z[J] = Z_{k\Lambda}[J] \ \exp -\frac{1}{\hbar}\left(\frac{1}{2} J_A f^{-2}_{k\Lambda} (R^{-1}_{k\Lambda})^{AB} J_B\right). \tag{2.9}$$

Here the cutoff-dependent partition function is given by a functional integral of the IR fields Φ^A:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{k\Lambda}[J] &= \int \mathcal{D}\Phi^* \prod_A \delta\left(\Phi^*_A\right) Z_{k\Lambda}[J,\ \Phi^*], \\ Z_{k\Lambda}[J,\ \Phi^*] &= \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \exp \frac{1}{\hbar}\left(-W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] + J_A f^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\Phi^A\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

The Wilsonian effective action $W_{k\Lambda}$ has a path integral representation[3]

$$\exp\left(-W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]/\hbar\right) = N_{k\Lambda} \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\phi^* \prod_A \delta\left(f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^*_A - \phi^*_A\right) \ \exp -S_{k\Lambda}[\phi, \Phi, \phi^*]/\hbar, \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$S_{k\Lambda}[\phi, \Phi, \phi^*] = S[\phi, \phi^*] + \frac{1}{2}(\Phi - f_{k\Lambda}\phi)^A (R^{k\Lambda})_{AB} (\Phi - f_{k\Lambda}\phi)^B. \tag{2.12}$$

The action given in (2.11) is the average action, which was introduced by Wetterich[5] to realize a continuum analog of the block spin transformation. The average action describes

[3] In our previous papers the notation Γ_k was used for the average action, but it is reserved here to denote the Legendre effective action.

the dynamics below the IR cutoff. Obviously the path integral (2.10) over the IR fields must be the same as the original partition function (2.7). The relation is given in (2.9): there is a factor depending on the source J, which produces a trivial IR cutoff dependence for $Z_{k\Lambda}$.

Let us discuss some properties of the functions appeared in the definition of the average action in (2.11) and (2.12). The function $f_{k\Lambda}(p^2)$ is for the coarse graining of the UV fields. For our discussion in this paper, we do not need its concrete form, but require it to behave such that $f_{k\Lambda}(p^2) \approx 0$ for $k^2 < p^2 < \Lambda^2$, and $f_{k\Lambda}(p^2) \approx 1$ outside of this interval. The cutoff functions $(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}$ are introduced to relate the IR fields with the UV fields. The IR fields are identified roughly with the average fields, $\Phi^A(p) \approx f_{k\Lambda}(p^2)\phi^A(p)$. Because of this relation for the fields, we impose the constraints $\Phi^*_A = f_{k\Lambda}^{-1}\phi^*_A$ for the antifields in (2.8) and (2.11) to keep the canonical structure in the space of fields and antifields. We may choose the cutoff functions as

$$\begin{aligned}(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}(p,-q) &= (\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB}(p)(2\pi)^d\delta(p-q),\\ (\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB}(p) &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{AB}(p)}{f_{k\Lambda}(1-f_{k\Lambda})}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

The invertible matrix $(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}$ has the signature $\epsilon((R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}) = \epsilon_A + \epsilon_B$. This matrix and its inverse satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}(R^{k\Lambda})_{BA} &= (-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B+\epsilon_A\epsilon_B}(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB},\\ \left(R^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\right)^{BA} &= (-)^{\epsilon_A\epsilon_B}\left(R^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\right)^{AB}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

All non-vanishing components of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{AB}(p)$ are assumed to be some polynomials in p. As a possible choice, it may be identified with D^{-1}_{AB}, the inverse (free) propagator for the fields ϕ^A and ϕ^B.

In (2.12), we find that the terms $\phi^A f^2_{k\Lambda}(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}\phi^B$ can be regarded as a regulator and that the integration of the UV fields is performed for those modes with momenta between k and Λ. The terms $f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^B(R^{k\Lambda})_{BA}$ act as sources for the UV fields ϕ^A in place of J_A in (2.7). In order for this replacement to realize, we included J dependent contributions in the gaussian integral (2.8). The remaining terms $\Phi^A(R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}\Phi^B$ do not affect the path integral of the UV fields. We may define therefore a subtracted average action by removing these terms from $W_{k\Lambda}$:

$$\hat{W}_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] - \frac{1}{2}\Phi^A\left(R^{k\Lambda}\right)_{AB}\Phi^B. \tag{2.15}$$

It should be noticed that $\hat{W}_{k\Lambda}$ is the generating functional of the connected cutoff Green functions of the UV fields.

We now discuss the behaviors of the average action when the cutoff k reaches the IR and UV boundary values, 0 and Λ. At the UV scale, $k \to \Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\Lambda} f_{k\Lambda}(p^2) &= 1,\\ \lim_{k\to\Lambda}(\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB}(p) &= \infty.\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Then,

$$\lim_{k\to\Lambda} W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = S[\phi,\ \phi^*] \quad (\Phi^A \to \phi^A). \tag{2.17}$$

This formally implies that the UV action $S[\phi,\ \phi^*]$ is defined at the UV scale Λ. For the IR limit $k \to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k\to 0} f_{k\Lambda}(p^2) &= 0, \\ \lim_{k\to 0} (\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB}(p) &= \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

In this limit, one finds in (2.12) that the sources $f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^B(\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{BA}$ become finite as $\lim_{k\to 0} f_{k\Lambda}(\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB} = \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{AB}$, and the regulator contributions $\phi^A f_{k\Lambda}^2 (R^{k\Lambda})_{AB}\phi^B$ vanish. However, the remaining terms $\Phi^A(\mathcal{R}^{k\Lambda})_{AB}\Phi^B$ become divergent, and act as infinite "mass terms" for the average action $W_{k\Lambda}$. The subtracted average action given in (2.15) thus suits the discussion of the IR limit.

2.3 The quantum master equation for the UV and IR fields

Now we show that an exact gauge (BRS) symmetry is realized along the RG flow, though deformed due to the regularization. It inherits from the original symmetry of the UV action $S[\phi,\ \phi^*]$. Our basic assumption to specify the symmetry is that the UV action is a solution of the QME, $\Sigma[\phi,\ \phi^*] = 0$. For a given classical action, such a solution is known to exist at least in perturbation theory[25]. It is a nontrivial problem to fix BRS non-invariant counter terms for a given regularization scheme. We will discuss this issue in a forthcoming paper[23] and assume here that the UV action solves the QME.

Let us consider the WT functional Σ for the IR fields,

$$\Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] \equiv \hbar^2 \exp(W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)\Delta_\Phi \exp(-W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar) = \frac{1}{2}\left(W_{k\Lambda},\ W_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi - \hbar\Delta_\Phi W_{k\Lambda}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $(\ ,\ )_\Phi$ and the Δ_Φ denote the antibracket and Δ derivative for the IR fields. In order to relate the WT operator for the UV action (2.4) to that for the average action, we take the functional average of the former with respect to the regularized UV action. In the formulation given in this paper, the path integral of the UV fields includes integration over the antifields. This requires a slight modification of our previous discussion given in ref.[21]. After some calculation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Sigma[\phi,\ \phi^*]\rangle_{\phi:f\Phi R} &= \hbar^2 \exp(W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar) N_{k\Lambda} \int \mathcal{D}\phi\mathcal{D}\phi^* \prod_A \delta\left(f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^*_A - \phi^*_A\right) \\ &\qquad \times \exp\left[(S - S_{k\Lambda})/\hbar\right]\left[\Delta_\phi \exp(-S/\hbar)\right] \\ &= \hbar^2 \exp(W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)\Delta_\Phi \exp(-W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar) = \Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Here $\langle F\rangle_{\phi:J}$ denotes the functional average of F with respect to the fields ϕ^A in the presence of sources J_A.

As $\Sigma[\phi,\ \phi^*] = 0$, therefore, the average action automatically obeys the QME, $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = 0$ for any k. This clearly demonstrates the presence of exact BRS symmetry along the RG flow. We call it renormalized BRS (rBRS) symmetry. The result given here generalizes our previous results[20][21], where we assumed that the UV action is linear in the antifields and satisfies the classical master equation.

The QME is understood as follows. Let us consider a set of the rBRS transformation:

$$\Phi^A \to \Phi^A + \delta_r \Phi^A \lambda, \qquad \delta_r \Phi^A = \left(\Phi^A,\ W_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi, \tag{2.21}$$

where λ is an anti-commuting constant. In general, the average action cannot remain invariant under (2.21). It transforms as

$$W_{k\Lambda} \to W_{k\Lambda} + \frac{1}{2}\left(W_{k\Lambda},\ W_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi \lambda. \tag{2.22}$$

At the same time, the functional measure[4] transforms as

$$\mathcal{D}\Phi \to \mathcal{D}\Phi\left(1 + \Delta_\Phi W_{k\Lambda}\lambda\right). \tag{2.23}$$

If the QME is satisfied, these two contributions cancel each other, leaving the functional integral $\mathcal{D}\Phi \exp(-W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)$ invariant. Importance of the contribution from the jacobian factor in the QME was noticed already in [26] and [27].

Because of the presence of the $\Delta_\Phi W_{k\Lambda}$ term, one may introduce another effective transformation called the quantum BRS transformation [26] (See also [25]). For any operator $F[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]$, it is defined by

$$\delta_Q F \equiv \left(F,\ W_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi - \hbar\Delta_\Phi F. \tag{2.24}$$

The quantum BRS transformation δ_Q is nilpotent,

$$\left(\delta_Q\right)^2 F = \left(F,\ \Sigma_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi = 0, \tag{2.25}$$

if the QME is satisfied. It is however no longer a graded derivation:

$$\delta_Q(FH) = F(\delta_Q H) + (-)^{\epsilon_H}(\delta_Q F)H - \hbar(-)^{\epsilon_H}(F,\ H)_\Phi. \tag{2.26}$$

One may define the cohomology using the quantum BRS transformation δ_Q. Observables can be specified as elements of the cohomology. A violation of the QME may induce a violation of the nilpotency condition for δ_Q and it corresponds to a gauge anomaly.

3 The exact RG flow equations and canonical transformation

[4]Note that the functional measure for the IR fields is flat in (2.8).

3.1 The exact RG flow equations

The change in the average action resulting from lowering k is described by the exact RG flow equations[2-5]. It is obtained by differentiating (2.12) with respect to k:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_k \exp\left(-W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\Phi^*]/\hbar\right) &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi\mathcal{D}\phi^*\partial_k\Big[N_{k\Lambda}\prod_A \delta(f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^*_A-\phi^*_A)\\ &\qquad\times\exp-(S_{k\Lambda}[\phi,\Phi,\phi^*]/\hbar)\Big],\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

where the normalization function is given by $N_{k\Lambda}=\exp[\mathrm{Str}(\ln R^{k\Lambda})/2]$. This yields

$$\partial_k \exp\left(-W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\Phi^*]/\hbar\right) = -\left(X+\mathrm{Str}\left[\partial_k(\ln f_{k\Lambda})\right]\right)\exp\left(-W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\Phi^*]/\hbar\right),\tag{3.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}X &= (-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B+1}\,\frac{\hbar}{2}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^B}+\partial_k(\ln f_k)\left[\Phi^A\frac{\partial^l}{\partial\Phi^A}-\Phi^*_A\frac{\partial^l}{\partial\Phi^*_A}\right],\\ \mathcal{M}^{AB} &\equiv f^2_{k\Lambda}\partial_k\left[f^{-2}_{k\Lambda}(R^{-1}_{k\Lambda})^{AB}\right].\end{aligned}\tag{3.3}$$

The operator X is the fundamental operator which characterizes the RG flow. The first term in X originates from the k dependence of $f^2_{k\Lambda}R^{k\Lambda}_{AB}$. The second corresponds to the effects of a scale transformation on Φ^A and Φ^*_A. The scale transformation on the antifields appears in (3.3) because of the constraints $\Phi^*_A=f^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\phi^*_A$.

We showed in the previous section that the QME, $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]=0$, at an arbitrary scale $k(<\Lambda)$ results from the QME $\Sigma[\phi,\ \phi^*]=0$. The same conclusion may be obtained from the flow equation for $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}$[11]. The exact RG flow equation (3.2) and the functional $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}$ in (2.19) are characterized by differential operators, X and Δ_Φ, respectively. Since X contains a term related to the scale transformation on Φ^*,[5] it commutes with Δ_Φ:

$$[\Delta_\Phi,\ X]=0.\tag{3.4}$$

It follows from (3.2), (2.19) and (3.4) that

$$\partial_k\Sigma_{k\Lambda}=\exp(W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)\left[X\exp(-W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)\right]\Sigma_{k\Lambda}-\exp(W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)X\left[\exp(-W_{k\Lambda}/\hbar)\Sigma_{k\Lambda}\right].\tag{3.5}$$

The rhs of this equation consists of terms proportional to functional derivatives of $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}$. Suppose that the QME, $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]=0$, holds for some k. It is an identity for *any* Φ and Φ^* so that any functional derivatives of $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}$ should also vanish. Therefore, if $\Sigma_{k\Lambda}=0$ at some k, $\Sigma_{k+dk\Lambda}=0$ $(dk<0)$: the flow equation for the WT functional Σ ensures that the rBRS invariance of the quantum system persists along the RG flow.

3.2 The canonical transformation generating the RG flow

Let us discuss the BRS invariance realized along the RG flow from a new perspective. In the antifield formalism, we may consider the canonical transformations, which leave

[5] In ref.[21], such a term was not included in X so that $[\Delta_\Phi,\ X]\neq 0$.

the classical master equation invariant since it is written in the form of the antibracket. However the transformations do change the QME or the operator Δ, since a canonical transformations in the field-antifield space induces a nontrivial jacobian factor (see appendix B). In order for a canonical transformation to make the QME invariant, one needs to take account of the associated jacobian factor: the action should be transformed suitably to cancel the jacobian factor as shown in appendix B.

Now take two actions on a RG flow, $W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]$ and $W_{(k+dk)\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]$ $(dk < 0)$, which satisfy the QME. An apparent question is then whether there is a canonical transformation which relates these actions. Let us answer to this question affirmatively.

As shown in appendix B, under the canonical transformation with the generator G,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^A &\rightarrow \bar{\Phi}^A = \Phi^A + (\Phi^A,\ G)_\Phi, \\ \Phi^*_A &\rightarrow \bar{\Phi}^*_A = \Phi^*_A + (\Phi^*_A,\ G)_\Phi, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

the action changes by $-\delta_Q G$. For the following generator,

$$G[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = (-)^{\epsilon_B+1}\ \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_A \mathcal{M}^{AB} \frac{\partial^r W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi^B} dk - \Phi^*_A \partial_k \left(\ln f_k\right) \Phi^A dk, \tag{3.7}$$

we obtain up to $O((dk)^2)$

$$-\delta_Q G = \partial_k W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] dk + \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_B \mathcal{M}^{BC} \frac{\partial^r}{\partial \Phi^C} \Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi, \Phi^*] dk. \tag{3.8}$$

The second term in (3.8) vanishes for the average action $W_{k\Lambda}$ satisfying the QME. However eq. (3.8) itself holds for *any* average action defined as (2.11), which does not necessarily satisfy the QME. A few more comments are in order. 1) The second term in (3.8) is proprotional to the antifields other than the WT operator Σ. The term is zero for the BRS invariant system due to the gauge fixing condition, $\Phi^*_A = 0$. 2) Note that the canonical transformation (3.6) with (3.7) does not affect the gauge fixing conditions $\Phi^*_A = 0$ in (2.10), as the new antifields $\bar{\Phi}^*_A$ are proportional to Φ^*_A.

Eq. (3.8) may be rewritten as

$$W_{(k+dk)\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] - \delta_Q G. \tag{3.9}$$

As discussed in appendix B, it is exactly the transformation of the action which makes the QME invariant.

Thus there exists the canonical transformaiton which generates the infinitesimal change of the action along the RG flow keeping the QME intact. The entire RG flow is generated by a successive series of canonical transformations in the space of fields and antifields. To reach the physical limit $k \rightarrow 0$ is equivalent to find the corresponding finite canonical transformation.

It has been pointed out that the RG flow for the effective action can be regarded as reparametrizations of the fields[13]. The antifield formalism provides us with its extension as canonical transformations. It is certainly intriguing to realize this new perspective of the RG flow for gauge theories.

4 The average action and the Legendre effective action

We have given in previous sections a general formulation of the renormalized symmetry realized on the RG flow. The concept of the average action is of crucial importance to reveal the structure of the symmetry. In the literature, however, the RG flow has been discussed often by using the Legendre effective action rather than the average action. These two kinds of effective actions may play complementary roles. Construction of the Legendre effective action for the classical UV fields is the subject of this section. It allows us to make clear the relation between our approach and others.

We begin with an effective action:

$$\exp -\hat{W}_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]/\hbar = N_{k\Lambda}\int \mathcal{D}\phi\mathcal{D}\phi^* \prod_A \delta\left(f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^*_A - \phi^*_A\right)$$
$$\times \exp -\frac{1}{\hbar}\left(S[\phi,\ \phi^*] + \frac{1}{2}\phi^A f^2_{k\Lambda} R^{k\Lambda}_{AB}\phi^B - \Phi^A f_{k\Lambda} R^{k\Lambda}_{AB}\phi^B\right). \tag{4.1}$$

It is the generating functional of the connected cutoff Green functions of the UV fields, and is related to the average action by (2.15). In (4.1) the background IR fields act as the sources for the UV fields in the following combinations:

$$j_A = \Phi^B f_{k\Lambda} R^{k\Lambda}_{BA}. \tag{4.2}$$

We may perform the Legendre transformation

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}[\varphi,\ \varphi^*] \quad = \quad \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] + j_A\varphi^A, \tag{4.3}$$

where the classical UV fields φ^A are defined as the expectation values of the UV fields ϕ^A in the presence of the sources j_A,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^A &= -\frac{\partial^l \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial j_A},\\ j_A &= \frac{\partial^r \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \varphi^A}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

The antifields are related as

$$\varphi^*_A = \phi^*_A = f_{k\Lambda}\Phi^*_A. \tag{4.5}$$

The above eqs. (4.2), (4.4) and (4.5) give the functional relations $\varphi^A = \varphi^A[\Phi, \Phi^*]$. Using

$$\frac{\partial^r \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi^A} = -\varphi^B f_{k\Lambda} R^{k\Lambda}_{BA}, \tag{4.6}$$

eqs. (2.15), (4.2) and (4.4) one further obtains

$$\frac{\partial^r W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi^A} = f^{-1}_{k\Lambda}\frac{\partial^r \Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \varphi^A}, \tag{4.7}$$

where the Legendre effective action is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{k\Lambda}[\varphi,\ \varphi^*] &\equiv \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}[\varphi,\ \varphi^*] - \frac{1}{2}\varphi^A f_{k\Lambda}^2 R_{AB}^{k\Lambda}\varphi^B \\
&= W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi^A - f_{k\Lambda}\varphi^A\right) R_{AB}^{k\Lambda}\left(\Phi^B - f_{k\Lambda}\varphi^B\right). \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}
$$

From (4.8), we find the following relations,

$$
\left.\frac{\partial^l \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi_A^*}\right|_{\Phi\ \text{fixed}} = \left.\frac{\partial^l W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi_A^*}\right|_{\Phi\ \text{fixed}} = f_{k\Lambda}\left.\frac{\partial^l \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \varphi_A^*}\right|_{\varphi\ \text{fixed}} = f_{k\Lambda}\left.\frac{\partial^l \Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \varphi_A^*}\right|_{\varphi\ \text{fixed}}. \qquad (4.9)
$$

The identity $\partial\varphi^A/\partial\varphi^B = \delta^A_B$ leads to

$$
\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi\partial\varphi}\right)^{-1}_{AC} \equiv (-)^{\epsilon_C+1}\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial j_A \partial j_C}\right). \qquad (4.10)
$$

Using (4.1), (4.3) and (4.10), we derive the flow equation for the Legendre effective action:

$$
\partial_k\Gamma_{k\Lambda} = \frac{\hbar}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_A}\left[\partial_k\left(f_{k\Lambda}^2 R_{AB}^{k\Lambda}\right)\right]\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi\partial\varphi}\right)^{-1}_{BA} - \frac{\hbar}{2}\,\partial_k \mathrm{Str}(\ln R^{k\Lambda}). \qquad (4.11)
$$

The WT identity for the Legendre effective action can be obtained from the QME for the average action. One finds from (4.7) and (4.9) that

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left(W_{k\Lambda},\ W_{k\Lambda}\right)_\Phi = \frac{\partial^r W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\Phi^A}\ \frac{\partial^l W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\Phi_A^*} = \frac{\partial^r \Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi^A}\ \frac{\partial^l \Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi_A^*} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma_{k\Lambda},\ \Gamma_{k\Lambda}\right)_\varphi, \qquad (4.12)
$$

and from (4.4) and (4.10) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\Phi W_{k\Lambda} &= \frac{\partial^r\partial^l W_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\Phi^A\partial\Phi_A^*} = \left(f_{k\Lambda}\frac{\partial^r\partial^l\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi^B\partial\varphi_A^*}\right)\frac{\partial^r\varphi^B}{\partial\Phi^A} \\
&= (-)^{1+\epsilon_A(1+\epsilon_C)}\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi_A^*\partial\varphi^B}\right)\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\hat{W}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial j_B\partial j_C}\right) f_{k\Lambda}^2 R_{AC}^{k\Lambda} \\
&= \left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi_A^*\partial\varphi^B}\right)\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi\partial\varphi}\right)^{-1}_{BC} f_{k\Lambda}^2 R_{CA}^{k\Lambda}. \qquad (4.13)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the QME takes the form

$$
\Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = \frac{\partial^r\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi^A}\ \frac{\partial^l\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi_A^*} - \hbar\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\Gamma_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi_A^*\partial\varphi^B}\right)\left(\frac{\partial^l\partial^r\hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial\varphi\partial\varphi}\right)^{-1}_{BC} f_{k\Lambda}^2 R_{CA}^{k\Lambda} = 0. \qquad (4.14)
$$

When applied to the pure Yang-Mills theory, (4.14) reduces to the "modified ST identity" obtained by Ellwanger[11]. It might be understood as follows: the first term of (4.14) is equal to the antibrackets $(\Gamma_{k\Lambda},\ \Gamma_{k\Lambda})_\varphi/2 = (W_{k\Lambda},\ W_{k\Lambda})_\Phi/2$, which cannot

vanish because the symmetry is violated by the regularization. It should be compensated by the remaining "symmetry breaking terms." This is the reason why (4.14) has been called as the broken or modified WT identity. In our point of view, the origin of this symmetry breaking terms becomes more transparent. They are nothing but the $\Delta_\Phi W_{k\Lambda}$ term arising from the nontrivial jacobian factor associated with non-invariance of the functional measure for the IR fields Φ^A under the rBRS transformation. It is *necessary* therefore for the quantum system under consideration to be BRS invariant. Note that this interpretation becomes possible only when we consider the average action $W_{k\Lambda}[\Phi, \Phi^*]$. On the other hand, the RG flow equations are shown to take a simpler form when expressed in terms of the $\Gamma_{k\Lambda}[\varphi, \varphi^*]$. This is because the Legendre effective action consists only of the one-particle irreducible (1PI) cutoff vertex functions. In this sense, the average action and the Legendre effective action play complementary roles.

We shall close this section with the following remarks:
(1) Let us consider the IR limit $k \to 0$. In the path integral (4.1), the regulator terms proportional to $f_{k\Lambda}^2 \mathcal{R}_{AB}^{k\Lambda}$ are removed in this limit. Thus $\lim_{k\to 0} \hat{W}_{k\Lambda}$ and $\lim_{k\to 0} \hat{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda} = \lim_{k\to 0} \Gamma_{k\Lambda}$ are found to be free from any singularities and well-defined. They are the generating functionals of the connected Green function and 1PI vertex function, respectively. In the WT identity (4.14), "the symmetry breaking terms" are again proportional to $f_{k\Lambda}^2 \mathcal{R}_{AB}^{k\Lambda}$ and vanish in the IR limit. Thus, we conclude that $\lim_{k\to 0} \Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] = \lim_{k\to 0}(W_{k\Lambda},\ W_{k\Lambda})_\Phi/2 = \lim_{k\to 0}(\Gamma_{k\Lambda},\ \Gamma_{k\Lambda})_\varphi/2 = 0$: all the quantum fluctuations of the UV fields are integrated out to yield the Zinn-Justin equation.
(2) There is another way to reach the Zinn-Justin equation. We may consider the standard Legendre effective action based on the path integral (2.10) for the IR fields,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}[\Phi_{cl},\ \Phi^*] = -\hbar \ln Z_{k\Lambda}[J,\ \Phi^*] + f_{k\Lambda}^{-1} J_A {\Phi_{cl}}^A, \tag{4.15}$$

where

$$f_{k\Lambda}^{-1}\Phi_{cl}^A \equiv \hbar \frac{\partial^l \ln Z_{k\Lambda}}{\partial J_A}. \tag{4.16}$$

In the construction of this effective action, all the quantum fluctuations of the UV fields are integrated out. Therefore, the action should obey the Zinn-Justin equation. Actually, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda},\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}\right)_{\Phi_{cl}} = \frac{\partial^r \mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi_{cl}^A}\frac{\partial^l \mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda}}{\partial \Phi_A^*} = \langle \Sigma_{k\Lambda}[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]\rangle_{\Phi:f_{k\Lambda}^{-1}J}\,. \tag{4.17}$$

Thus, the QME $\Sigma_{k\Lambda} = 0$ yields the Zinn-Justin equation for the Legendre effective action, $(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda},\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_{k\Lambda})_{\Phi_{cl}} = 0$.

5 Conclusions

We have shown here that symmetries are not violated but only deformed by regularizations. This point of view emerges from a careful study of the WT identities for the effective theory. It is actually a nontrivial problem to derive them in the RG approach.

Our observation is that when applied to a Wilsonian effective action called the average action, they take the form of the QME in the antifield formalism. It serves to make conceptually clear that there exist exact renormalized symmetries realized along the RG flow.

Because of generic interactions among the UV fields, neither the IR action nor the functional measure of the IR fields can remain BRS invariant. The QME ensures the cancellation between these contributions. We have used the relation between the average and the Legendre effective action to show that the QME for the former is equivalent to the "modified WT or ST identity" for the latter. This leads to the identification of the "symmetry breaking terms" with the jacobian factor mentioned above.

The use of the antifield formalism allows us not only to deal with most general gauge theories with open and/or reducible gauge algebra, but also to reveal the interesting structure of the RG flow and associated renormalized BRS symmetry. First, we may define the quantum BRS transformation for the symmetry. It is nilpotent, while it does not obey the Leibniz rule. Second, any two average actions on the RG flow are shown to be connected via a canonical transformation.

Our arguments on the renormalized BRS symmetry given here are based on the assumption that the UV action or the average action at some IR cutoff $k = k_0$ obeys the QME. In perturbation theory, imposing the QME or the WT identities at some value of k is called the "fine-tuning", which has been discussed extensively in refs.[7,9,10,12]. There, used was a regularization where the IR and UV cutoffs are incorporated in a same regulator, and the boundary conditions were imposed on the relevant and irrelevant operators separately. This procedure makes solving the QME rather complicated. We shall discuss in a forthcoming paper[23] an alternative method using the Pauli-Villars UV regularization. It allows us directly to confirm that the QME holds at one-loop level for a given anomaly-free UV action.

It has been recognized that the QME plays an important role in the investigation of the unitarity in string field theory[27]. The formalism for the renormalized symmetry given here will be another example where the QME plays a crucial role. It is difficult but highly desirable to solve the QME in a non-perturbative truncation of the average action.

Acknowledgment

K.I. would like to thank M. Bonini for discussions on the subject and the theory group of Parma University for their kind hospitality. H.S. (K.I.) is supported in part by the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.12640259 (12640258) from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

A A matrix notation

In this work we use a matrix notation which corresponds to the DeWitt's condensed notation in the d-dimensional Euclidean momentum space. In this notation, the discrete indices, $A,\ B, ...$, indicates the momentum variables as well. A generalized summation convention is used in which a repeated index implies not only a summation over various quantum numbers but also a momentum integration. For example,

$$f^A_{\ B} = g^A_{\ C}\ h^C_{\ B} \tag{A.1}$$

is a shorthand description of

$$f^A_{\ B}(p,-q) = \sum_C \int \frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d} g^A_{\ C}(p,-k)\ h^C_{\ B}(k,-q). \tag{A.2}$$

The functional derivative is normalized as

$$\frac{\partial \phi^A}{\partial \phi^B} = \delta^A_{\ B} \equiv \delta_{AB}(2\pi)^d \delta(p-q). \tag{A.3}$$

We often use

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^A M^{(1)}_{AB} \cdots M^{(n)}_{CD} \phi^D &= \int \frac{d^dp_1}{(2\pi)^d} \cdots \int \frac{d^dp_{n+1}}{(2\pi)^d} \phi^A(-p_1) \\ &\quad \times M^{(1)}_{AB}(p_1,-p_2) \cdots M^{(n)}_{CD}(p_n,-p_{n+1}) \phi^D(p_{n+1}), \qquad \text{(A.4)} \\ \frac{\partial^r}{\partial \phi^A} M^{(1)AB} \cdots M^{(n)CD} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial \phi^*_D} &= \int \frac{d^dp_1}{(2\pi)^d} \cdots \int \frac{d^dp_{n+1}}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\partial^r}{\partial \phi^A(p_1)} M^{(1)AB}(p_1,-p_2) \cdots \\ &\quad \times M^{(n)CD}(p_n,-p_{n+1}) \frac{\partial^l}{\partial \phi^*_D(-p_{n+1})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial^r/\partial\phi^A$ $(\partial^l/\partial\phi^A)$ denotes a right (left) derivative with respect to ϕ^A. These derivatives are related as

$$\frac{\partial^r F}{\partial \phi^A} = (-)^{\epsilon_A(\epsilon_F+1)} \frac{\partial^l F}{\partial \phi^A}. \tag{A.5}$$

B The canonical transformation for the RG flow

Take a generic action $W[\Phi,\Phi^*]$ and consider an infinitesimal canonical transformation with a generator $G[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}^A &= \Phi^A + (\Phi^A,\ G)_\Phi, \\ \bar{\Phi}^*_A &= \Phi^*_A + (\Phi^*_A,\ G)_\Phi. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

The path integral identity,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \mathcal{D}\bar{\Phi}^* \delta(\bar{\Phi}^*) \mathcal{D}\bar{\Phi} \exp(-W[\bar{\Phi},\ \bar{\Phi}^*]/\hbar) \\ =& \int \mathcal{D}\Phi^* \delta(\Phi^*) \mathcal{D}\Phi \exp\left[-W[\bar{\Phi},\ \bar{\Phi}^*]/\hbar + \ln \mathrm{Sdet}\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}\bar{\Phi}}{\mathcal{D}\Phi}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

implies the infinitesimal transformation of the action is $-\delta_Q G \equiv -(G,\ W)_\Phi + \hbar\Delta_\Phi G$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W[\bar{\Phi},\ \bar{\Phi}^*] - \hbar \ln \mathrm{Sdet}\frac{\mathcal{D}\bar{\Phi}}{\mathcal{D}\Phi} \\
= \ & W[\Phi + (\Phi, G),\ \Phi^* + (\Phi^*, G)] - \hbar \ln\left(1 + (-)^{\epsilon_A}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\frac{\partial^l}{\partial\Phi^*_A}G\right) \qquad \text{(B.3)} \\
= \ & W[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] - (G,\ W)_\Phi + \hbar\Delta_\Phi G = W[\Phi,\ \Phi^*] - \delta_Q G.
\end{aligned}
$$

A comment is in order. In writing (B.2), we assumed that the generator G itself is proportional to Φ^* so that the canonical transformation does not change the gauge fixing condition. The generator in (3.7) is in this category. However the change of the action obtained above is correct for more generic situation (See for example [25]).

Now choose the generator $G[\Phi, \Phi^*]$ in the form of (3.7) with $W_{k\Lambda}$ replaced by W. Let us consider the contribution from the first term of (3.7),

$$
G_1[\Phi, \Phi^*] = (-)^{1+\epsilon_B}\frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_A\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}dk. \qquad \text{(B.4)}
$$

The IR fields transform as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}^A &= \Phi^A + \left(\Phi^A, G_1\right)_\Phi \\
&= \Phi^A - \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_B}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}dk - \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_C+(\epsilon_A+1)(\epsilon_C+1)}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^l\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^*_A\Phi^C}dk, \qquad \text{(B.5)} \\
\bar{\Phi}^*_A &= \Phi^*_A + (\Phi^*_A, G_1)_\Phi \\
&= \Phi^*_A + \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_C+\epsilon_A(\epsilon_C+1)}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^l\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A\Phi^C}dk,
\end{aligned}
$$

which yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W[\Phi + (\Phi, G_1)_\Phi, \Phi^* + (\Phi^*, G_1)_\Phi] - W[\Phi, \Phi^*] \\
= \ & -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A}\left[(-)^{\epsilon_B}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B} + (-)^{\epsilon_C+(\epsilon_A+1)(\epsilon_C+1)}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^l\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^*_A\Phi^C}\right]dk \\
& + \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_C+\epsilon_A(\epsilon_C+1)}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^*_A}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^l\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A\partial\Phi^C}dk \\
= \ & -\frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B}\mathcal{M}^{BA}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}dk + \frac{1}{4}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^C}\Big[(W, W)_\Phi\Big]dk. \qquad \text{(B.6)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The Δ derivative of the generator reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\Phi G_1 &= -\frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B+1}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^*_A}\Big(\Phi^*_C\mathcal{M}^{CB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B})dk \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}dk - \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^C}\Delta_\Phi W dk. \qquad \text{(B.7)}
\end{aligned}
$$

From (B.6) and (B.7) we obtain the change of the action $-\delta_Q G_1$ as

$$
-\delta_Q G_1 = W[\Phi + (\Phi, G_1)_\Phi, \Phi^* + (\Phi^*, G_1)_\Phi] - W[\Phi, \Phi^*] + \hbar\Delta_\Phi G_1
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2}(-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B+1}\left(\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A} - \hbar\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}\right)dk \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^C}\left[\frac{1}{2}(W,W)_\Phi - \hbar\Delta_\Phi W\right]dk. \qquad \text{(B.8)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Likewise, for the second term of the generator $G[\Phi, \Phi^*]$,

$$
G_2[\Phi, \Phi^*] = -\Phi^*_A\left[\partial_k(\ln f_{k\Lambda})\right]\Phi^A dk, \qquad \text{(B.9)}
$$

we obtain

$$
-\delta_Q G_2 = -\partial_k(\ln f_{k\Lambda})\left(\Phi^A\frac{\partial^l W}{\partial\Phi^A} - \Phi^*_A\frac{\partial^l W}{\partial\Phi^*_A}\right)dk + \hbar\ \mathrm{Str}[\partial_k(\ln f_{k\Lambda})]dk. \qquad \text{(B.10)}
$$

Eqs. (B.8) and (B.10) are combined to give the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\delta_Q G &= (-)^{\epsilon_A+\epsilon_B+1}\,\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^A} - \hbar\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^A}\mathcal{M}^{AB}\frac{\partial^r W}{\partial\Phi^B}\right)dk + \hbar\ \mathrm{Str}\left[\partial_k(\ln f_{k\Lambda})\right]dk \\
&\quad -\partial_k\left(\ln f_{k\Lambda}\right)\left(\Phi^A\frac{\partial^l W}{\partial\Phi^A} - \Phi^*_A\partial_k\frac{\partial^l W}{\partial\Phi^*_A}\right)dk + \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^C}\Sigma[\Phi,\Phi^*]dk. \qquad \text{(B.11)}
\end{aligned}
$$

When the action $W[\Phi, \Phi^*]$ is an average action defined in (2.11), eq. (B.11) may be written as

$$
-\delta_Q G = \partial_k W[\Phi,\ \Phi^*]dk + \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*_B\mathcal{M}^{BC}\frac{\partial^r}{\partial\Phi^C}\Sigma[\Phi,\Phi^*]dk. \qquad \text{(B.12)}
$$

Here we used the flow equation for the average action which may be obtained from (3.2).

References

[1] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. **C12** (1974) 75.

[2] F. J. Wegner and A. Houghton, Phys. Rev. **A8** (1973) 401.

[3] J. F. Nicoll and T. S. Chang, Phys. Lett. **62A** (1977) 287.

[4] J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. **B231** (1984) 269.

[5] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B352** (1991) 529; Phys. Lett. **B301** (1993) 90; Z. Phys. **C60** (1993) 461.

[6] B. J. Warr, Ann. Phys. **183** (1988) 1.

[7] C. Becchi, On the construction of renormalized quantum field theory using renormalization group techniques, in *Elementary particles, Field theory and Statistical mechanics*, eds. M. Bonini, G. Marchesini and E. Onofri, Parma University 1993.

[8] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B 417** (1994) 181; *ibid* **B 427** (1994) 291; F. Freire and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B380** (1996) 337.

[9] M. Bonini, M. D'Attanasio and G. Marchesini, Nucl. Phys. **B418** (1994) 81; *ibid* **B421** (1994) 429; *ibid* **B437** (1995) 163; Phys. Lett. **B346** (1995) 87; M. Bonini and E. Tricarico, Nucl. Phys. **B585** (2000) 253-274.

[10] M. Bonini and G. Marchesini, Phys. Lett. **B389** (1996) 566.

[11] U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. **B335** (1994) 364; U. Ellwanger, M. Hirsch and A. Weber, Z. Phys. **C69** (1996) 687.

[12] M. D'Attanasio and T. R. Morris, Phys. Lett. **B378** (1996) 213.

[13] T. R. Morris, *A Manifestly Gauge Invariant Exact Renormalization Group* Lectures given at Workshop on the Exact Renormalization Group, Faro, Portugal, 10-12 Sep 1998, hep-th/9810104

[14] T. R. Morris, Nucl. Phys. **B573** (2000) 97; JHEP **0012** (2000) 012.

[15] M. Simionato, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 2121; *ibid* **A15** (2000) 2153; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 4811-4848.

[16] M. Pernici, M. Raciti and F. Riva, Nucl. Phys. **B520** (1998) 469.

[17] K-I. Aoki, K. Morikawa, J-I Sumi, H. Terao and M. Tomoyose Prog. Theor. Phys. **97** (1997) 479; K-I. Aoki, K. Takagi, H. Terao and M. Tomoyose, Prog. Theor. Phys. **103** (2000) 815.

[18] M. Lüscher, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 342; Nucl. Phys. **B549** (1999) 295.

[19] P. Ginsparg and K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D25** (1982) 2649.

[20] Y. Igarashi, K. Itoh and H. So, Phys. Lett **B479** (2000) 336.

[21] Y. Igarashi, K. Itoh and H. So, Prog. Theor. Phys. **104** (2000) 1053-1066, hep-th/0006180.

[22] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. 102B (1981) 27.

[23] Y. Igarashi, K. Itoh and H. So, in preparation.

[24] T. R. Morris, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 2411.

[25] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, (1992) Princeton University Press; J. Gomis, J. Paris and S. Samuel, Phys. Rept. **259** (1995) 1-145; W. Troost and A. Van Proeyen, *An introduction to Batalin-Vilkovisky Lagrangian Quantisation*, unpublished notes.

[26] P. M. Lavrov and I. V. Tyutin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **41** (1985) 1049

[27] H. Hata, Phys. Lett. **B217** (1989) 438; Phys. Lett. **B217** (1989) 445; Nucl. Phys. **B329** (1990) 698-722.